

Attorney's Docket No.: 07319-091002

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above referenced application is respectfully requested.

Initially, claims 2-21 stand rejected based on judicially-created obviousness-type double patenting. Since a terminal disclaimer will apparently have no effect on patent term, a terminal disclaimer is filed herewith. This should obviate the rejection based on judicially created obviousness type double patenting.

Claims 2-21 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as allegedly being unpatentable over Cleveland in view of Wharton. This contention, however, remains respectfully traversed. With all due respect, it is respectfully suggested that the rejection does not meet the patent office's burden of providing a prima facie showing of unpatentability.

Claim 2 recites a belt and a redirecting mechanism that holds the belt on the side of the pulley which is closest to the motor. The rejection alleges that Cleveland could be modified according to the teaching of Wharton.

However, there is no incentive in either Cleveland nor Wharton, nor the combination thereof, to make such a combination between these references. Cleveland teaches a specific way of winding his belt. The belt is wound quite simply, in a

*Don't enroll
3/24/2005
@*